

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 7 is amended.

The proposed drawing correction filed on December 30, 2002, was approved in the Office Action mailed October 1, 2003. As requested, enclosed with this Amendment for filing are 3 sheets of formal drawings.

In the response filed December 30, 2002, a portion of claim 1 was inadvertently omitted as compared to claim 1 as filed. The previously omitted portion, “and the base plate has a proof stress not higher than 320 (MPa) and a thickness not smaller than 1 mm” has been reinserted in claim 1 above.

Claim 7 has been amended to remove the phrase “characterized by.” No narrowing amendment is intended.

Claims 1 – 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagase et al. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagase et al. in view of Hayashi et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Neither Nagase nor Hayashi teach or suggest the metal-ceramic circuit board as claimed in claim 1, or the power module as claimed in claim 7. Nagase discloses that “a ceramic circuit board with a heat sink includes a ceramic substrate, first and second aluminum plates laminated and *bonded onto both sides of the ceramic substrate through Al-Si-based brazing solders*, respectively . . . .” (Column 2, lines 4 – 8) Hayashi discloses “an aluminum alloy sheet that . . . is particularly suitable for external automobile body plates.” (Abstract)

The cited references therefore do not teach or suggest the metal-ceramic circuit board as claimed in claim 1, “wherein one surface of the ceramic substrate board is *bonded directly* to the base plate,” in cooperation with the other claimed elements. The cited references also do not teach or suggest the power module of claim 7, “wherein one surface of the ceramic

substrate board is *bonded directly* to the base plate,” in cooperation with the other claimed elements. Refer, for example, to page 9, line 19 – page 10, line 30, of the specification.

Therefore, claims 1 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2 – 6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for these reasons. The rejections to dependent claims 2 – 6 are respectfully traversed but are not expressly argued in view of the allowability of the underlying independent claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



James H. Patterson  
Registration No. 30,673

Customer No. 24113  
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.  
4800 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100  
Telephone: (612) 349-5741